

AUG-16-05

12:37

FROM-SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

650-493-4549

T-247 P.001/002 F-577

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
2465 E. BAYSHORE ROAD SUITE 406
PALO ALTO, CA 94303
TELEPHONE: (650) 493-4540
FACSIMILE: (650) 493-4549

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 16 2005

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

Date: August 16, 2005
To: Examiner Belix Ortiz
Organization: USPTO
Fax Number: 703-872-9306
From: James R. Riegel

Re: U.S. Application No. 10/010,371
Group Art Unit 2164
Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

This is page 1 of 2 page(s).

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above, and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

AUG-16-05

12:37

FROM-SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

650-493-4548

T-247 P.002/002 F-577

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

Application No.: 10/010,371

First Named Applicant: Namik Hrle

Examiner: Belix Ortiz

Art Unit: 2164

Status of Application: pending

Tentative Participants:

1) James Riegel

2) Belix Ortiz

3)

4)

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 16 2005

Proposed Date of Interview: 8/17/04

Proposed Time: 3:30 pm

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) [X] Telephonic

(2) [] Personal

(3) [] Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES

[X] NO

If yes, provide brief description:

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>102(e) rej.</u>	<u>1-4, 9, 12-17, 20-27</u>	<u>Ponnekanti</u>	[]	[]	[]
(2) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]
(3) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]
(4) _____	_____	_____	[]	[]	[]

[] Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

In the office action mailed 5/18/05, the Examiner stated (pages 9-10) that Ponnekanti teaches that a row is skipped if data does not qualify, at col. 3, lines 62-65. However, these lines disclose skipping the row when status bits are "unset" which is not during an update operation being performed, unlike Applicant's claims. Similarly, the Examiner cites col. 4, lines 6-10 and 16-18, but these lines describe a delete operation, not an update as recited by Applicant. The Examiner also cites col. 4, lines 27-30 of Ponnekanti, which describe an update operation, but the described update operation skips a row only when the "lock instant" request can be granted—when a lock is not currently held on the row. Unlike Ponnekanti's update operation, Applicant's update skips a row when a lock is currently held.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by Applicant and submitted to the Examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of Applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, Applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)